

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In Re

MALINKA MOYE,

Plaintiff.

No. C-14-2533 EMC (pr)
No. C-14-2535 EMC (pr)
No. C-14-2786 EMC (pr)
No. C-14-2787 EMC (pr)
No. C-14-2788 EMC (pr)
No. C-14-2790 EMC (pr)
No. C-14-2792 EMC (pr)
No. C-14-2793 EMC (pr)
No. C-14-2794 EMC (pr)
No. C-14-2859 EMC (pr)
No. C-14-2878 EMC (pr)
No. C-14-3235 EMC (pr)


**ORDER DENYING POST-JUDGMENT
MOTIONS**

These *pro se* civil rights actions were dismissed in late September - early October 2014. Within a few days after (or in a few actions, before) the entry of judgment, Plaintiff filed in each action an *ex parte* application opposing dismissal and/or an *ex parte* declaration opposing dismissal. Plaintiff's application and declarations opposing the dismissals are construed in each action to be a motion for relief from the judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). See Docket # 23 in Case No. C 14-2533 EMC; Docket # 22 in Case No. C 14-2535 EMC; Docket # 18 in Case No. C 14-2786 EMC; Docket # 20 in Case No. C 14-2787 EMC; Docket # 18 in Case No. C 14-2788 EMC; Docket # 19 in Case No. C 14-2790 EMC; Docket # 21 in Case No. C 14-2792 EMC; Docket # 22 in Case No. C 14-2793 EMC; Docket # 22 in Case No. C 14-2794 EMC; Docket # 16 in Case No. C 14-2859 EMC; Docket # 15 in Case No. C 14-2878 EMC; and Docket # 18 in Case No. C 14-3235 EMC. In each action, the motion for relief from the judgment is **DENIED** because Plaintiff does not identify any basis for setting aside the judgment; he does not identify any of the listed

1 reasons or even provide a reason that might fit under Rule 60(b)(6)'s catch-all provision for relief
2 from the judgment. His mere disagreement with, or opposition to, a dismissal is not a proper ground
3 to set that dismissal aside.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6
7 Dated: March 4, 2015

8
9 
EDWARD M. CHEN
United States District Judge